

REMARKS

Claims 1-16, 23-27, 30-38 and 43 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-10, 15, 23-27, 30-33 and 38 are amended, and claim 43 is added. Claims 17-22, 28, 29 and 39-42 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer due to the Restriction Requirement.

Applicants appreciate the Office Action's indication that claims 5, 7-14, 16 and 30-38 contain allowable subject matter.

Applicants thank Examiner LaRose for the courtesy extended to Applicants' representative, Mr. Luo, during the April 22, 2005 personal interview. The substance of the personal interview is incorporated in the following remarks.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to acknowledge consideration of the references listed in Form PTO-1449 of the Information Disclosure Statement filed herewith.

I. Claims 1-4 and 23-25 Are Patentable Over Hamilton

The Office Action rejects claims 1-4 and 23-25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent 6,075,889 to Hamilton, Jr. et al. ("Hamilton"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action asserts that Hamilton discloses all elements recited in claims 1-4 and 23-25. However, Hamilton does not disclose or suggest (1) local curvature values for at least two color components, as recited in claims 1 and 23; (2) a local curvature value based only upon a color component other than a type of a color component at the interpolation target pixel, as recited in claims 3 and 24; or (3) a local curvature value corresponding to the first color component with respect to the interpolation target, the first color component being one of a red, green or blue value in a color space, or a chrominance value in a color space, as recited in claims 4 and 25.

Hamilton discloses calculating blurred luminance value B33. See col. 5, lines 20-35. As discussed during the personal interview, Hamilton does not disclose or suggest local

curvature values for at least two color components, a local curvature value based only upon a color component other than a type of a color component at the interpolation target pixel, or a local curvature value corresponding to the first color component with respect to the interpolation target, the first color component being one of a red, green or blue value in a color space, or a chrominance value in a color space. Therefore, Hamilton does not disclose each and every element recited in claims 1, 3, 4 and 23-25.

For at least the above reasons, Hamilton does not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 1, 3, 4 and 23-25, and claim 2, depending therefrom. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-4 and 23-25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is respectfully requested.

II. Claims 6 and 26 Are Patentable Over Takahashi

The Office Action rejects claims 6 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent 6,744,916 to Takahashi ("Takahashi"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action asserts that Takahashi discloses all elements recited in claims 6 and 26. However, Takahashi does not disclose or suggest a second similarity judgment section that judges degrees of similarity to the interpolation target pixel along at least two crossing directions different from the two crossing directions in which the degrees of similarity are judged by a first similarity judgment section, as recited in claim 6, and similarly recited in claim 26.

Takahashi discloses a minimal value computing section 307 that computes a minimal value between two values in the horizontal direction output from computing sections 301 and 303, and a minimal value computing section 308 that computes a minimal value among two vertical values output from computing sections 302 and 304. See Fig. 3 and col. 7, lines 32-67. As discussed during the interview, each of the two minimal value computing sections 307 and 308 compute "parallel" values. Takahashi does not disclose or suggest judging degrees of

similarity along at least two crossing directions different from the two crossing directions in which the degrees of similarity are judged by a first similarity judgment section. Therefore, Takahashi does not disclose each and every element recited in claims 6 and 26.

For at least the above reasons, Takahashi does not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 6 and 26. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is respectfully requested.

III. Claims 15 and 27 Are Patentable Over Lu

The Office Action rejects claims 15 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent 5,805,217 to Lu et al. ("Lu"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action asserts that Lu discloses all elements recited in claims 15 and 27. However, Lu does not disclose or suggest a weighting coefficient that is constituted of color information corresponding to a plurality of color components, as recited in claims 15 and 27.

Lu discloses a weighting coefficient. See col. 5, lines 55-59. However, as discussed during the personal interview, Lu does not disclose or suggest that the weighting coefficient is constituted of color information corresponding to a plurality of color components. Therefore, Lu does not disclose each and every element recited in claims 15 and 27.

For at least the above reason, Lu does not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 15 and 27. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 15 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

IV. Claim 43 is Patentable Over Hamilton


New claim 43 is patentable over Hamilton at least in view of the patentability of claim 1, from which it depends, as well as for the additional features it recites. For example, Hamilton does not disclose or suggest local curvature values that are calculated in accordance with directionality of similarity with regard to an interpolation target pixel.

V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-16, 23-27, 30-38 and 43 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



Mario A. Costantino
Registration No. 33,565

Gang Luo
Registration No. 50,559

MAC:GXL/djb

Attachment:
Information Disclosure Statement

Date: April 26, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--